year behind the proper time.

What, he (Mr. V.) would ask, will be the receipts and What, he (Mr. V.) would ask, will be the receipts and expenditures of the next fiscal year? And what will be the deficiency that must be provided for by loan? The Secretary of the Treasury estimates it at twenty millions five hundred thousand. He (Mr. V.) was afraid that in this the Secretary was again as much below the mark as we now know he was a year ago. He estimates the receipts for next year at thirty-five millions—thirty-two from customs and three from the public lands. Now, he had already shown that to the extent of the interest on the twenty million loan of last year, and no further, can he use the proceeds of the public lands to pay the expenses of the year; and there is great cause to fear that the soldiers' bounty land warrants will so dry up the sales as not to bring money enough from that source to pay even the interest on that loan. the interest on that loan.

Then there is nothing left to fall back upon but the cus-

toms. So many causes—many of them oftentimes acciden-tal or occult—which are brought suddenly into action, so greatly influence the commerce of the country that no certain es-timates can be made—they must of necessity be approxima-tions only to the truth. Judging, however, from certain great and general causes now at work, the revenue from the cus-toms for the year which begins on the 1st of July next cannot safely estimated at more than twenty-six or twenty-seven lions—say twenty-seven—and put the land at a million and a half, making twenty-eight and a half for the year.

This is the measure of the means of the Government. He therefore deducted six and a half millions from the Secretary's estimate. What, on the other hand, will be the ex-There is now a much larger force in the public penditures? There is now a much larger force in the public service than was employed at the beginning of the present year; and the fact that the Executive is pressing Congress for a large addition to it shows that, even if no more troops are granted by Congress, all now there will continue to be employed, and that therefore there is not the for a large addition to it shows that, even if no more troops are granted by Congress, all now there will continue to be employed, and that therefore there is not the remotest probability that the expenses of the next year will fall below those those of this remotest probability that the expenses of the next year will fall below those those of this, assuming them to be no more. He had before shown that the estimates for this year already sent in, amount to sixty-two mil ions seven hundred and eighty-three thousand six hundred and sixty dollars; that probably two and a half millions must be added to that for under-estimates in the Quartermaster's Department—bringing it up to upwards of sixty-five millious; to which must be added at least two millions for additional interest next year on the loan now proposed to be raised, and that which must be raised at the beginning of the year to meet the wants of the year—say sixty-seven millions of dollars. From this amount take the next year's revenue—twenty eight and a half miltake the next year's revenue—twenty eight and a half mil-lions—and there will be a deficiency of thirty-eight and a half and a half, as estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury— showing that the estimate for this year and next is about equally below the real wants of the Government; that for next year, upon this calculation, being seventeen millions less than the wants of the Government, while that for this year is now admitted to have been sixteen millions too small, with every probability, as he had before shown, that the deficit to ied by loan will reach twenty-three millions or more. t must be borne in mind that the Quartermaster General's es-imate alone for the next year was cut down five millions and estimate having been for that Department \$19,291,200, which was reduced to \$14,250,000. The Quartermaster General, it will also be borne in mind, says it will require the most rigid economy to make the reduced estimates do, should there be no economy to make the reduced estimates do, should there be no heavy losses of property, no extraordinary operations undertaken during the year, and the troops be not increased. We know that more troops are urgently demanded; that losses of property must occur; that the Executive has now changed his policy, and is resolved upon carrying the war to the vital sof the enemy, which, in plain English, means to overrun and subduct the whole war territory of Mexico. and in pursuance subdue the whole vast territory of Mexico; and, in pursuance of that policy, we already hear that great operations are organizing for the reduction of Potosi and Queretaro. What, then, will be the public debt at the end of the next fiscal year if the war continue? This has become a solemn and alarming inquiry. He had already put down the probable debt at the end of this year at seventy-three millions eight hundred thousand dollars. If to that be added thirty-eight and a half millions for the deficit of next year, the amount, at the close of that year, will be upwards of one hundred and twelve mil-If, however, the sixteen millions now asked for will do for

this year, then the debt at the end of next year, should there be a deficit of no more than thirty-eight and a half millions in that year, will be but one hundred four and a half millions. According to the estimates of the Secretary of the Treasury, the debt at the end of the next year will be eighty-six and a half millions. These estimates are all predicated upon the supposition that the increased force asked for is not raised. If that is raised, it must largely increase the public expenditures. It must be estimated for, and appropriations made hereafter for its support. Any one of these estimates exhibits a sad prospect for the country. Looking at this bill as a mere money transaction between the Government and the public creditor, it may be thought to be more honest than expedient to make a limit of the first may be thought to be more honest than expedient to make a disclosure of the present and prospective condition of the finan-cial affairs of the country; but it is not to be forgotten that cial affairs of the country; but it is not to be forgotten that before the declaration was made. Had she that right? There is another party whose agents we are, the tax-paying people who must foot the bills, and who have a right to know how, by whom, and the truth and the whole truth—to know how, by whom, and for what their money is expended. He felt bound to say, that of the opinions he had stated are deduced, he could not rely with entire confidence in the correctness of all his conclusions a but they were nevertheless conclusions he could not avoid He sincerely hoped, for the sake of the country, nuch above the future wants the Government as the past estimates of the Executive are

now known to have been below them.

Mr. LIGON next obtained the floor, and addressed the committee at length mainly on the subject of internal improve-ments by the General Government, a policy to which he ex-pressed his decided opposition. When he concluded the com-mittee rose and the House adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1848.

On motion of Mr. COBB, of Georgia, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. Borrs in the chair,) and proceeded to the consideration of the bill to authorize a loan not to exceed the sum of

the committee (he said) authorizing the research that committee (he said) authorizing the research that is the cause and dollars. It became them all to inquire what is the cause of this difficulty, and of the Government being involved to the extent that renders it necessary to agk for a loan of that amount? It was necessary for the people to know what induced this state of things—whether we ner really just, and orable and fair manner. His colleague (Mr. Vixrox) the other day had shown clearly that it was the object of the Administration to conceal all the measures it contemplated from the citizens of the United States—to conceal the real situation and condition of public affairs from the people, who have the right to know. He (Mr. V.) had shown clearly that the Administration over-estimated in the one case and under-estimated the income of the Government. It is other—over-estimated the income of the Government of a principle which would seriously affect to a foot of land at the mouth of the river, and if a right extended to its source.

If the principle for which gentlemen had contended on this stationed at Matamoros. Of this there was no evidence. The stationed at Matamoros. Of this there was no evidence. The was contrary to be the truth. There was no collection of troops to wow interests. Suppose, for instance, that Texas should early that the things are the establishment of a principle which would seriously affect our own interests. Suppose, for instance, that Texas should early that the establishment of a principle which would seriously affect the sumption was unsustained: nay, the proof established in our Government, it would be contrary to be the truth. There was no evidence. The was the establishment of a principle which would seriously affect on the river, as a state of this the establishment of a principle which would seriously affect our own interests. Suppose, for instance, that Texas should be assumption was unsustained: nay, the proof established in our Government, it would be contrary to the estab

the lst of July in the appropriation the appropriation to be provided as an energency, he short estimate where well-discontinuous they should have either to retreat or a battle. Now, he would have either to retreat or to come over an dent directed that this was a false construction put that the the value of the history of this republic its President and her them to encounter the horrors and danger and her being them in order to carry on an unjust, unnecessary, and her sought her with them to encounter the horrors and danger and her sought her with them to encounter them to retreat or to co ascertain what was the real difference between them—on what points as we are now obliged to do, by reason of the short estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury, when the twenty-three million born offit was passed at the last session. He should have ample time to negotiate his loan before the money is wanted. It is, therefore, the clear duty of the Executive to ask that provision may be made at this session for all the wants of the Government for the next year, and not come, as at present, a year behind the proper time.

What he (Mr. V.) would ask, will be the receipts and

the Mexicans shed the first blood—shed American blood on American soil; that they struck the first blow. And many other things were introduced here. Well, he (Mr. F.) took a different position.

He believed the war was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced; consequently it was unjustly commenced; and that too not by the President of the United States, and by his order. He took the ground also, and he challenged proof to the contrary, that there had been not a single Mexican foot placed, nor a drop of American blood shed, on American soil, since the commencement of the war. He would not every himself but that the annexation of Texas was a remote cause of war. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. McLinz) said the other day that he considered the war unavoidable on our part; and to his (Mr. Fisher's) mind—and he thought it must be so to the mind of every man—it was apparent that if Texas had not been annexed there would have been no war. But was the annexation of Texas unavoidable on our part? Again, he believed the immediate cause of war was the removal of our forces to the Rio distinction. gentlemen opposite had attempted to justify this act of the President of the United States. The sident of the United States by attempting to prove that the territory lying between the Nueces and the Rio Grande belonged to Texas. Now, if in this those gentlemen had failed to justify the President for moving our troops to the Rio Grande—if it should be shown that that territory belonged to to justify the President for moving our troops to the Rio Grande—if it should be shown that that territory belonged to Mexico—it would be apparent that the President of the United States had been guilty of causing an invasion of the territory of a neighboring republic. He would examine some of the grounds on which these positions rested, and endeavor to discover some point on which all parties could unite; for where there were conflicting assertions, where there were irrecont cilable statements, it became necessary to fix on some ground so my which to start. Well, this ground he found here. It was admitted on all hands, and it would not be disputed by any so one, that the territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande did once lawfully and indisputably belong to Mexico. No one he apprehended would dispute that. Here then was ground on which to stand, and from which we may reason with respect to the claims of either party. Taking then this as the basis of the argument—that Mexico once indisputably owned that territory—the next question which arose was, Did Texas subsequently become the owner of that territory, and how did she become possessed of it? Such a position was proved by existing documents to be untrue. Mr. Donelson, our Chargé ad 'Affaires to Texas, says in one of his letters that the most westerly point, be it observed; consequently the other territory, and complete by Mexicans. The most westerly point, be it observed; consequently the other territory, and coupied by Mexicans. The most westerly point, be it observed; consequently the other territory, and coupied by Mexicans. The most westerly point, be it observed; consequently the other territory, and coupied by Mexicans. The most westerly point, be it observed; consequently the other territory between the Nueces of the Nuel President and of the war whether it would not be an agression on our part to do this on the Rio Grande; and if they were consistent, and adhered to the principle of the President, if establishing the fact and it inevitable conseq existing documents to be untrue. Mr. Donelson, our Chargé d'Affaires to Texas, says in one of his letters that the most westerly point occupied by Texas was Corpus Christi. The most westerly point, be it observed; consequently the other territory, if occupied at all, was occupied by Mexicans. The published despatches of Gen. Taylor to this Government also state that there was a Mexican custom-house and officers at Brasos Santiago. How, then, did Texas become the owner of that texticant. that territory?
It had been admitted here, and he presumed it would not

west than the Nucces river. It was also admitted that the title of Texas extended as far as her jurisdiction, which, by her re-bellion, she secured and exercised. But did Texas by her rebellion against Mexican authority obtain and exercise jurisdiction over the territory lying between the Nucces and the Rio Grande? Did she extend her jurisdiction and the limits of her republic so as to embrace that territory? She claimed Corpus Christi and no more. Consequently, as had been said a day or two since by the gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. Steners,) it might be considered that the boundary was in the great, the "stupendous desert," as it had been called, over which neither the Mexican nor the Texan Government had extended jurisdiction. He contended—and the gentlemen opposite her as a lost signated to its original owners. There were four ways by which territory could be acquired. First, by discovery; secondly, by occupation; thirdly, by conquest; and fourthly, by purchase. Well, then, as Mexico had an undisputed right to this territory, Texas of course had no right to it, and consequently it could not be claimed as American soil. It was also shown to be untrue that in this war Mexico struck the first blow. We have proof to the contrary. It was demonstrable that we were the aggressors. The documents to which gentlemen opposite had access did not sustain the position they had assumed.

But the advocates of this war took other ground. They maintain that our claim for indemnity for spoliations on the commerce of our citizens was justifiable cause of war. But now be disputed, that originally Texas did not extend further west than the Nucces river. It was also admitted that the title which neither the Mexican nor the Lexan Government had extended jurisdiction. He contended—and the gentlemen opposite had not proved to the contrary—that Mexico possessed the valley of the Rio Grande, from its mouth to its source. the valley of the kilo Grande, from his mouth to be source. It was occupied by Mexican citizens; it was in their indisputable possession. Who would doubt that? If any ventured table possession. Who would doubt that? If any ventured to do so he had the documents before him, from which he could prove his position to be based on truth. If, then, Mexico was in possession of that territory, he asked what right had Texas to claim it?

It had been assetted by some gentlemen on this floor that the constitution of the republic of Texas claimed all the ter-ritory to the Rio Grande, and that the constitution of Texas, after her annexation, reiterated the same claim. For the benefit of the gentlemen who had made such assertions he would remark that he had those constitutions before him, and he could find nothing of the kind in either of them. Neither of could find nothing of the kind in either of them. Neither of those constitutions claimed the Rio Grande as the boundary line. There was an act, or declaration, that the Rio Grande should be the line of boundary between Mexico and Texas. A declaration? And here let him inquire if it was this declaration that gave Texas the right to that country, or was the right possessed before? The declaration most assuredly could give no right. If, therefore, Texas had the right, she had it hefore the declaration was made. Had she that right? There valid claim in consequence of the contract with Santa Anna. Santa Anna had no authority over that territory more than was possessed by any other General commanding; and if he had, he was a prisoner at the time the treaty was made. Satan, on the mount with the Saviour of the world, promised the Redeemer all the kingdoms of the earth if he would fall down and worship him; but he promised that which he did not possess. And so it was with Santa Anna: for he had not the right to give a foot of land in that territory. Thus, then, it appeared that the claim of Texas was based on her own declaration. Now, if a declaration will give title, what would prevent every member on this floor having as much land as he tidout his subject, and as he thought every general end on this subject, and as he thought every general that the time the treaty was made. Sateman must believe who looked at the facts free from party that if we carry it on to the conquest of the whole of Mexico; and believing as he did on this subject, and as he thought every general that who looked at the facts free from party that if we carry it on to the conquest of the whole of Mexico; and believing as he did on this subject, and as he thought every general that who looked at the facts free from party that if we carry it on to the conquest of the whole of Mexico; and believing as he did on this subject, and as he thought every general that the war was unjustly commenced on our part—that if we carry it on to the conquest of the whole of Mexico, it will prove destructive, to our own Government—he asked what they were to do as honorable men and as patriots in such a convention of the war was unjustly commenced on our part—that if we carry it on to the conquest of the whole of Mexico, it will prove destructive, to our own Government—he asked what they were to do as honorable men and as patriots in such a convention of the war was unjustly commenced on our part—that if we carry it on to the conquest of the whole of Mexico, it will prove destructive, to our own Gov chose? It was very certain that Mexico exercised jurisdiction over that territory, and it was equally as certain that Texas could get it only by one of two ways—conquest or treaty. Well, did Texas conquer that territory? Every one present knew she did not, although it had, he believed, been said by some gentlemen that her forces had been driven to the oppo-site side of the river. If this were 'so on one or two occa-\$18,500,000.

Mr. FISHER, who was entitled to the floor from last evening, addressed the committee. There was a bill now before the committee (he said) authorizing the President of the United States to borrow some eighteen millions five hundred thousand dollars. It became them all to inquire what is the cause of this difficulty, and of the Government being involved to

and coulditon of public affairs from the people, who have the right to know. He (Mr. V.) had shown clearly that the Administration over-estimated in the one case and under-estimated in the other-over-estimated in the other-over-estimated to the conce ase and under-estimated in the other-over-estimated to the conce ase and under-estimated in the other-over-estimated to the first part of t

the Mississippi river, so as to compel the American forces that might be in New Orleans either to go back or come over and fight him, would not this be cause of war?

Mr. BROWN, of Virginia, inquired whether the Rio Grande was not blockaded by General Taylor on his own

authority '
Mr. FISHER replied that he was establishing the fact and

those of Texas had. Now, precisely the reverse of this wa the truth. No Texan ever made a tour to the eastern bank of the Rio Grande without being either captured or killed. How, then, could it be maintained that Texas had conquered or revolutionized, and therefore Texas had no right to it, and could not justly claim it. It belonged to its original owners.

But the advocates of this war took other ground. They maintain that our claim for indemnity for spoliations on the commerce of our citizens was justifiable cause of war. But did they mean to contend that the war was commenced for the purpose of obtaining indemnity from Mexico? Why, this would be an admission that the President commenced the war. The spoliations on our commerce by Mexico were not acts of recent date; what right, then, had the President to

to do so he had the documents before him, from which he could prove his position to be based on truth. If, then, Mexico was in possession of that territory, he asked what right had It had been said—and it was frequently reiterated by the advocates of the President and of the war—that the boundary of Louisiana formerly extended over that territory. This, however, was a position which, he believed, had been abandoned; for, if Louisiana did once extend so far, it afterwards unquestionably belonged to Mexico, and was known as the Department of Tamaulipas. He repeated the inquiry, then, what right had Texas to it?

It had been asserted by some gentlemen on this floor that the constitution of the republic of Texas claimed all the territory than the constitution of the republic of Texas claimed all the territory.

Acts of recent date; what right, then, had the President to make war for indemnities? This position was an aggravation rather than a justification of the act of the President. But again: gentlemen said Mr. Slidell was rejected, and hence we had cause of war. But would it be pretended that the President had the right to commence war because Mexico rever, the President had acted in good faith, Mr. Slidell would not have been rejected, and he believed war would not have ensued. Mexico asked for a commissioner to settle the difficulties existing between the two Governments, and our President sent a minister plenipotentiary to reside there, and Mexico refused to receive him in that character, as she had the constitution of the republic of Texas claimed all the territory. the right to do. Herrera and Paredes both asked for a com nissioner, which our President refused to send. Subsequently however, he sent Mr. Trist as a commissioner, when we were involved in a war, from all the horrors of which we might have been spared if a commissioner had been sent in the first

as in their power lay it was their duty, by some means, to stop this atrocious war. As just men and as patriots the must do this. From the discharge of this duty they had no

must do this. I from the discharge of this dot, we escape but in wrong doing.

But some gentlemen had argued that the war was constitutionally made, and yet they contended that the President had no constitutional power to invade the territory of a neighboring nation. He had power to repel invasion and to suppress interest in the had no right to good an army among the nation. He had power to repet invasion and to suppress in-surrection, but he had no right to send an army among the citizens of Mexico on the Rio Grande. Nor was there any evidence that Mexico contemplated an invasion. Some gen-tlemen had asserted that Mexico had collected troops in great

when were entirely unirue, for which there was no foundation, and by using arguments which were either utterly unsound and fallacious or foreign to the subject. This might seem to be a strong position, but it was no stronger than the truth.

It would take a long time for him to trace out all the untrue statements that had been made by the opposite party. When he said their statements were untrue, he did not conquered it. Was there, then, any thing done to justify the marching of our army to the Nico When he said their statements were untrue, he did not conquered it. Was there, then, any thing done to justify the marching of our army to the despotism. It was not as to estimate the truth.

Well, then, such being the facts; the was apparent Texas had not conquered it. Was there, then, and the valley of the Rio Grande. Well themselves in a position unervisible indeed. Their state ments that had been made by the opposite party. Was there any evidence of an intended invasion of Texas by a Mexican force? It had been roundly asserted by some gentlemen, over and over again, that the President of the whole world the world was a stated that Ampudia, with the forces under his commanded? The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Rontavson) stated that Ampudia, with the forces under his commanded, and the world when we had the seasons the west of the fact, of course it could not the Rio Grande. Well, what was done there? And who would be dangerous to the bietry of our own citizens. It was not a surely not republicanism. And what would being them amongst usagainst their inclinations of the laws duty to know better: and whenever knowledge was a stated that Ampudia, with the forces under his command, and what deep to the old world, and caused the world. Their state ments, their arguments, they were apposed to the history of that affair they would find not the least evidence will not be safe, the first blow, or any blow, until after of fa

sistent with our own institutions.

The President now told us that the whole object of the war was to obtain indemnity. That was the avowed object of this war. The President claims indemnity not only for spoliations on the property of our citizens, but for the expenses of this war. Now, where were they to stop? He again appealed to the House—to every member of it, as a patriot jealous of the honor of his country—to aid in putting a stop to this war. If we proceed with the war on this principle the result was obvious. It was evidently the determination of the President obvious. It was evidently the determination of the President to subdue the whole of Mexico and annex it to the United States; and this he (Mr. F.) would endeavor to prevent as far as as had the power. Could this be done? Gentlemen opposite had asked what were our terms of peace; and to that question he answered that he would make peace now precisely as he would have made peace soon after the war began. He would claim nothing on account of the expenses of the war; and hence he held that we were entitled to nothing that we had no claim to before the commencement of hostilithat we had no claim to before the commencement of hostili-ties. He would, in the next place, seek to establish a boun-dary line between the two republics, and that line he believed should be in the "stupendous desert" beyond the Nueces. He would then secure indemnity for our citizens for the losses they had sustained; and this was all he would desire, and it was all we should expect the Mexican Government to conser to. We should remember that, by waging an unjust war, by

to. We should remember that, by waging an unjust war, by contending for unreasonable indemnities, we were dishenoring our own nation. Some gentlemen who had preceded him had well said that injustice and unrighteousness were not consistent with national honor. So far as bravery in battle and the success of our arms was concerned, we have gained great honor in an unjust war; but, at the same time, we have been tanishing the national honor at home. And how shall we redeem ourselves from the stain? The first step should be to stop this unjust war. As a nation we must be just, for we read in the inspired volume that "righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

The Chairman's hammer here announced the termination of the gentleman's hour, and he yielded the floor, for which

The Chairman's hammer here announced the termination of the gentleman's hour, and he yielded the floor, for which there were many competitors.

Mr. THOMAS, of Tennessee, referred to the variety of subjects which had already been discussed during the pendency of this bill, in justification of the course of remark which he should take. A call had been made upon the President for the instructions given to Mr. Slidell; compliance with that call had been refused, and now we heard the course of the President denounced as throwing himself on his "royal pre-rogative" in withholding information. But the House had been passing resolution after resolution since that time asking information of the President, "if in his opinion it is not incompatible with the public interests to be communicated." Thus the very course of the House stood out a clear justifica-

But on this point he would refer to some of the views entertained by men who knew more of the spirit of the constitution than he professed to know. He would first read from a record made by Mr. Jefferson of the consultations of President Washington's Cabinet, dated March 31, 1792:

"Maken THE 31st, 1792.—A meeting at the President's:
"Maken THE 31st, 1792.—A meeting at the President's:
present Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, Henry Knox,
and Edmund Randolph. The subject was the resolution of
the House of Representatives, of March 27, to appoint a committee to inquire into the causes of the failure of the late expedition under Major General St. Clair, with the power to
all for such regrons, napers, and records as may be necessary pedition under Major General St. Clair, with the power to call for such persons, papers, and records as may be necessary to assist their inquiries. The committee had written to Knox for the original letters, instructions, &c. The President had called us to consult merely because it was the first example, and he wished that, so far as it should become a precedent, it should be rightly conducted. He neither acknowledged nor desired, nor even doubted the propriety of what the House were doing, for he had not thought upon it, nor was acquainted with subjects of this kind; he could readily conceive there might be papers of so secret a nature as they ought not to be might be papers of so secret a nature as they ought not to be given up. We were not prepared, and wished time to think given up. We were not prepared, and wished time to think and inquire.

"April 24.—Met again at the President's on the same sub-

"APRIL 24.—Met again at the President's on the same subject. We had all considered and were of one mind, first, that the House was an inquest, and therefore might institute inquiries; secondly, that it might call for papers generally; thirdly, that the Executive ought to communicate such papers as the public good would permit, and ought to refuse those the disclosure of which would injure the public; consequently were to exercise a discretion."

He alluded to the message of General Washington in 1796 upon this subject, to which so frequent reference had recently been made. A partof this message, he said, was wholly disapproved of by the Republican party of that day, led on by Giles and Madison. Mr. Madison made an able argument, which was reported at length, against the message of General Washington. But he did not say a single word against the position which was quoted by President Polk from General Washington's message. On the contrary, Mr. Madison, who was then heading the opposition to President Washington, used the following language, clearly sustaining Mr. Polk in the position he had taken. In the House of Representatives, April 6, 1796, Mr. Manison said:

"He thought it clear that the House must have a right in all cases to ask for information which might assist their deliberations on subjects submitted to them by the constitution; being responsible nevertheless for the propriety of the measure. He was as ready to admit that the Executive had a right, under a due responsibility, also to withhold information when of a nature that did not received a disclosure of its the time. And if the He alluded to the message of General Washington in 179

that did not permit a disclosure of it at the time. And if the sentation that the state of the business within his departmen and the contents of the papers asked for required it, although he might have regretted the refusal, he should have been little disposed to criticise it."

Again he says :

"If the Executive conceives that, in relation to his own de partment, papers could not be safely communicated, he might on that ground refuse them, because he was the competent though responsible judge within his own department."

Here, then, we had the authority of Washington and Madi son sustaining the course of Mr. Polk. Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Monroe, Gen. Jacks n, and other high authorities could be brought forward on this side, and not a single one could be found to the contrary.

Mr. T. referred to the effort that had been made by refer-

Mr. T. referred to the effort that had been made by reference to the course of Mr. Polk upon the call upon President Adams for information relative to the Panama Mission, to convict him (Mr. Polk) of inconsistency in now declining to communicate all the information demanded by the House, and he entered into a minute examination of that case, with a view to the complete vindication of Mr. Polk. He maintained that the doctrine the friends of the President advocated on the subject had been the doctrine of all parties since the foundation of the Government; and he referred to Judge Story and other elementary writers on the constitution, all of whom, he said, went to far as to say that the House of Representatives had no right to demand information of the President upon any subject in relation to our foreign affairs, but could go no forther than to request it. They held that this was the whole

right of the House.

Mr. Thomas said it was all important to look at the history of this war, to see how far it had progressed, wha sums it had cost, and, what was of far more consequence, what an amount of human life had been expended in its pro-secution. The gentleman on the other side, after contemplatseculion. The gentleman on the other side, after contemplating the whole affair, came to the conclusion that it was wrong, all wrong, and that all this vast amount of evil had been incurred in the prosecution of an unjust, unnecessary, and unconstitutional war. If that gentleman was in the right as to the character of the war, and the unconstitutional manner in which it had been commenced, then he was right in maintaining that we ought to recall our troops, and make a treaty with Mexico on precisely the same basis we had offered at the beginning; but, if his principle was right thus far, it ought to Mexico on precisely the same basis we had offered at the be ginning; but, if his principle was right thus far, it ought to have carried him further. If we had gone to war with Mexico unjustly, we owed her reparation. If all our war had been a wanton aggression on her rights and invasion of her territory, most certainly it was our duty to make her amendes as best we might. Why did he stop short of the manifest requirement of the manifest requirements of the manifest requirements. ments of justice? The gentleman discoursed very elequently about the principles of honor and justice, and he drew even from the good book itself in support of them; but, had he consulted that volume, he might have found about making restoation fourfold.

But let us examine the basis on which the charge again the Administration rested. The gentleman would have the world believe that all the evils of this state of war had beer brought upon the country by the unnecessary and unconstitu-tional march of our army to the banks of the Rio Grande. Now, it seemed to Mr. T. that, if gentlemen who brought this charge would but look back a little, they would find that they were placing their own friends in a rather awkward pre

On the 11th of May, 1846, when this House were engage in discussing the necessary measures to be taken in preparation for a possible war with England, an Executive message
came into the House stating that war existed on the banks of
the Rio Grande. An amendment was accordingly introduced
declaring that the war existed by the act of Mexico. This amendment was voted by the House—a majority of the Tennessee
delegation voting in the affirmative. And afterwards, when the
bill was introduced granting supplies in men and money, though
many gentlemen on the other side maintained stouly that the many gentlemen on the other side maintained stoutly that the amendment declared a lie, and that they were compelled to wate what they did not believe, yet all of them, with the exception of fourteen, voted in favor of the bill. Now admitting, for argument sake, that what they said was true, and the amendment declaring the war to exist by the act of Mexico was false, still, he asked, what was the bill for? To make provision to carry on the war. It placed fifty thousand volun-teers and ten millions of money at the disposition of the Presi-

knew that, why did they vote to prosecute the war? They might be forced to vote for the amendments if they voted for the bill, but who could force them to vote to carry on a war that was unnecessary, unjust, and unconstitutional? How far had the war proceeded when that bill was passed? As far as the House knew our army was encamped on the left bank of the Rio Grande, and the Mexican army was on the other bank, directly opposite. Some of these troops had crossed, and some American soldiers had been slaim. Did a state of things like that call for so vast an expenditure? Although Mr. T. professed to be a friend and supporter of the present Administration, he never had entertained, and he trusted he never should, so much respect for any Administration as to vote ten millions of dollars and fifty thousand men to aid it in carrying on an unjust, unnecessary, and unconstitutional war. According to these gentlemen, the war was all wrong, wrong from the start, begun by trampling on the constitution. When our troops were slain thay were in the territories of a friendly the bill, but who could force them to vote to carry on a war from the start, begun by trampling on the constitution. When our troops were slain they were in the territories of a friendly neighbor, where they had no right to be: and yet these gentlemen voted to give the President all he asked; and what

Mr. T. and his friends believed that the war had been be gun by Mexico; and if so, then both men and money ought to be voted, and voted freely, to carry it on. But how could to be voted, and voted freely, to carry it on. But how could gentlemen ever pretend to justify themselves, who believed, as they said, directly the reverse? Mr. T. maintained that the troops when encamped on the Rio Grande were just where they ought to have been: and therefore as Mexico had attacked them there, and so commenced the war, he held very consistently that the House were as much bound to vote for carrying on the war now as they were at first.

But gentlemen said they voted the bill not to carry on the war, but merely in order to relieve Gen. Taylor. The exercise

war, but merely in order to relieve Gen. Taylor. The excuse was frivolous—the answer perfectly nugatory. They knew perfectly that before the men they were voting could possibly reach Gen. Taylor, his fate would have been sealed. That reach Gen. Taylor, his late would have been sealed. That vote could not affect his safety or avail to deliver him from the greatest danger. He was three thousand miles off: who could pretend that he voted in the hope that relief would reach him, in consequence of that vote, in time to effect his rescue! It was vain to pretend it. They voted the bill then not to extricate Gen. Taylor. Should information reach the House to-day that the President of the United States had ordered an army across the St. Lawrence into Canada and the Canada. to-day that the President of the United States had ordered an army across the St. Lawrence into Canada, and that our general and his command were in imminent danger of being cut to pieces; they were one thousand miles off, in the interior of the country; and the President, while communicating these facts to Congress, should ask for millions of money and thousands of men to go to the rescue, who would vote such a bill? Who would not instantly ask, "why is our army in Canada? what right have they to be there?" And no gentleman would rise and say they had any right. But when Canada? what right have they to be there?" And no gentleman would rise and say they had any right. But when the supply bill passed at the commencement of this war, nobedy on the other side raised such an objection, but they voted the men and the money for the war. Now they pretended that it was only to relieve Gen. Taylor.

And now on the subject of the boundary of Texas. It had been said here, time and again, and he believed it was gen-

right, and that just so far as the revolution actually extended just so far and no farther her right to the territory extended with it. Well; take the question on that ground. Every one knew that, when a revolution prevailed in any country one knew that, when a revolution prevailed in any country against the previously existing government, it was not a pospossible thing to bound the extent of the revolution by precise lines, as a land surveyor would run the bounds of an estate with compass and chain. It was not practicable to tell within a rood just how far it could with truth be said that the revolution had spread itself. Now it was important, in order to come at this point, to look and see where the contending parties themselves considered the dividing line as running. When the declaration of independence was made by Texas in 1836, she had not precisely defined any bound ry. But subsequent events went to fix it. After the battle of San Jacinto had been fought, and President Santa Anna captured, a treaty. been fought, and President Santa Anna captured, a treaty, or something which bore the name, (whether it was strictly a or something which bore the name, (whether it was strictly a freaty or not he should not argue,) was entered into; and, though it might not be of binding power, still it went to show how the parties on both sides understood the boundary between them. Here were the representatives of the two countries met in one place, and they sat down to settle upon the line. On what did they agree, and what did they claim from each other? Texas claimed to the Rio Grande, while Mexico claimed up to the Sabine. There was the issue: and this showed what was the matter in dispute. If the treaty had no showed what was the matter in dispute. If the treaty had no other effect, it served to let Mexico know what Texas claimed. In 1843 an armistice took place, and in 1845 a second: the respective parties retired for the purpose of negotiating. The Mexicans went west of the Rio Grande, while the Texans went to the east side of it. In June, 1844, an effort was made by Mexico, under Gen. Woll, to reconquer Texas; and the invading general then issued a proclamation, in which he spoke of Texas as a revolted province of Mexico. That revolted province, whatever its boundaries were, was the Texas which we annexed to the United States. [Here Mr. T. quoted the proclamation of Gen. Woll, and argued, from the language he employed, that he regarded the Rio Grande as the guage he employed, that he regarded the Rio Grande as th boundary of the revolted province he had been sent to re conquer.]

But it was said that, on the banks of the Rio Grande, there

were certain peaceful Mexican settlements. Well; so there were. But what then? As he had already said, in fixing the great bounds and limits which separated different meet the little local conveniences of different neighborhoods. It was not possible to bound the extent of revolutions by lines going in and out, like the limits of a private estate. In our own revolution there had been Tories opposed to it, and Tory settlements where the flag of the new Government was not suffered to float. There were some who refused to fight on either side, and others who fought to retain the established Government; but did we at the peace surrender these local spots in the general acknowledgment of our national independence? Had Great Britain the face to ask that reservations should be made where-Britain the face to ask that reservations should be made whereever a Tory neighborhood existed? Besides, there was no
proof that these people settled on the Rio Grande were Mexican Tories to the Texan Government; on the contrary, the
proclamation put forth by Canales spoke of them as being notoriously unfriendly to Mexico, and as having said that they
never would submit again to Mexican authority. It might be
that they were non-combatants, and, on account of the too
near vicinity of the Mexican forces, were afraid to come out
and take open sides with Texas. But had any remonstrance
come up from them to Gen. Taylor showing that they were Mexican at heart? There might have been a few isolated cases, but none that evinced any thing like a concerted movement or general action. On these principles Mr. T. contended that, in establishing a national boundary line, regard could not be had to these isolated spots: we must fix on great and promi-nent natural features of the country, without attempting to suit the convenience of each particular neighborhood.

Mr. T. wished to call the attention of the committee to the

manifest inconsistency of gentlemen who were opposed to this war. The course of the Administration, according to them, war. The course of the Administration, according to them, was wrong, only wrong, and that continually. Nothing praise-worthy was to be found. But when these same gentlemen came to peak of another individual, and one who had had no little to do in carrying on the war, their lips could utter no-thing but praise. Now, Mr. T. had taken the pains to col-lect from the reports of the general in command, (a gentleman who, for the most part, was no very enthusiastic friend of this who, for the most part, was no very enthusiastic friend of this Administration—who certainly knew something about the facts in the case about which he was writing,) some extracts which he would read to the committee. He commenced with a letter from General Taylor to the Department of September 14, 1845; it was written from Corpus Christi, and it gave the opinion that he should not need volunteers to aid him in the execution of the orders received. He read also from another, dated October 8, in which he stated that the people on this side the river would not be average to his march, and, though he considered Corpus Christi as a very proper point to hold, he should have preferred an advanced position on the river—Corpus Christi was "too far from the frontier." Now, gentlemen on the other side warmly insisted that Corpus Christi was itself the frontier of Texas. Gen. Taylor, it seemed, was of a very different opinion. This view taken by General Taylor was corroborated by that of Canales, who, writing from Camargo, a small town immediately on the Rio del Norte, declares it to be the "northern frontier" of Mexico. He also quoted General Taylor as speaking of "our title to the Rio Grande." He thought that Corpus Christi might do well enough so far, but considered it his duty to suggest the expediency of advancing to the Rio Grande. Administration-who certainly knew something about the

enough so far, but considered it his duty to suggest the expediency of advancing to the Rio Grande.

Now, gentlemen on the other side would all admit that Gen. Taylor was actuated by a regard for the good of his country; so he must have considered it for the good of this country that our army should be advanced to the left bank of the Rio Grande, the very thing charged as so great an enormity on the President. Mr. T. next quoted another letter of Gen. Taylor, in which he disclaims all necessity of taking volunteers from the other States, and says that if any should be needed he should draw them from Texas. Now, what had Gen, Taylor been sent there for? To obtain all the interest in his power on the sent term of the sent and then had Gen. Taylor been sent there for? To obtain all the information in his power on the spot, and then to give to the Department his advice as a military man. His next letter acknowledged the receipt of the order of the 13th of January, ("the fatal order,") and speaks about his reaching the banks of the river, and being then able to judge of the temper of the inhabitants of the northern provinces of Mexico; but gave it as his opinion that the people on the river were well-disposed toward us, and that his advance to the river would have a great effect.

It had been contended that Gen. Taylor, in a subsequent otter, withdrew this advice in favor of advancing to the river

would generally remain quiet.

Now, let any one compare the language of gentlemen on the other side in regard to the President of the United States and to a chiefiain whom they considered themselves as enjoy-

ing a monopoly to extol.

He went on to quote from letters written by Gen. T. on the He went on to quote from letters written by Gen. T. on the 15th and 21st of April, after he had reached the river, and was encamped immediately opposite Matamoros. Here he spoke of our right to a joint navigation of the river, and the necessity, under certain circumstances, of "carrying the war, as it should be carried, into the enemy's country. He called for five thousand men, expressly for the purpose of marching into Mexico. Now he presumed Gen. T. knew as well as any man whether the war was begun by Mexico or by the United States.

The President of the United States on the 11th May said that the war had been commenced by Mexico, and Congress decreases.

the war had been commenced by Mexico, and Congress de-clared the same thing. On the 11th of March the Mexican minister, in his letter to our Government, declared that Mex-ico had used all efforts in her power to avoid the war, but it ico had used all efforts in her power to avoid the war, but it had been provoked on our part. A gendeman on the other side of the House, speaking the other day, had made the same statement. The Mexican minister used the term "provoked," so did gentlemen here. There seemed an entire agreement between their language and that of the Mexicans. Now, it might be that Mr. T.'s partiality for his own country blinded his perceptions of truth, but certain it was that he should not like to be found thus agreeing with the enemies of his country. Now, to see how far Gen. Taylor agreed with his enthusiastic admirers on this floor, he would read from a despatch of his, dated the 8th of May, in which, speaking of his answer to the Mexican request for an armistice, he tells Arista that cir-

dated the 8th of May, in which, speaking of his answer to the Mexican request for an armistice, he tells Arista that circumstances have changed, and that he could not now suspend an operation which "he had not initiated or provoked."

Mr. T. would leave the gentlemen on the other side to settle this difference in sentiment between themselves and the Mexican minister on the one side and Gen. Taylor on the other. Which was right? Both could not be. Here were the President of the United States and General Taylor on the one side and a Whiz majority of the Hones of Reviewspatistics. one side and a Whig majority of the House of Representatives on the other. He contended that these gentlemen had by their acts admitted before the world that Gen. Taylor was in the right. If not, then they were chargeable with all the consequences of the war. They had voted men and money to inflict these terrible evils both on Mexico and their to inflict these terrible evils both on Mexico and their own country. However reprehensible the President might be, they had gone further than he. He had ordered the army to the Rio Grande; they had carried it to the gates of Mexico. All the thousand miseries which had been endured, all the thousand scenes of wo which had since occurred were charged able on them. How many widow's waits and orphan's cries had gone up to Heaven witnessing against men who supplied all the means of carrying on an unjust and unnecessary war. Yes; these gentlemen had done it. They voted the supply bill—but why? They said the war was unjust—a war of invasion—a war of conquest—and still they voted to carry it on. Those on Mr. A.'s side had but acted as did their Revolutionary sires when they believed their rights to be invaded. They thought the war right and just—provoked by Mexico, and not to be avoided by us without dishonor. They were, therefore, chargeable with no inconsistency; but gentlemen who said it was "a lie" that Mexico begun the war, and yet woted a bill which proceeded on that assumption, how could voted a bill which proceeded on that assumption, how could they escape the responsibility of all the wees which followed in its train? For himself, he would rather have believed the falsehood (if falsehood it was) than voted the bill while disbe-

lieving it. Mr. T. here quoted the letter of the Secretary of War to Gen. Taylor, in which he directed him, should the common right of navigating the Rio Grande be resisted by Mexico, not to attempt to enforce it by military means. The course of the General was approved so far, but he must let the river alone. But Gen. Taylor, instead of letting the river alone, had ordered its mouth to be blockaded, and sent a message to Ampudia warning him that the Mexican army must either withdraw from the river or cross it and fight.

Now, gentlemen could scarce find language severe enough to censure the President for the "fatal order" to advance the army to the Rio Grande, and yet not a word of censure for Gen. Taylor, who had ordered, on his sole responsibility, the river to be blockaded, and that against the President's orders. Mr. T. here read a part of Gen. Taylor's letter to Ampudia, in which he tells the Spaniard that the war has been "forced upon us." What would he have said could be have foreseen

in which he tells the Spaniard that the war has been upon us." What would he have said could he have s the positions that would be taken by his own special admirers on that floor? He was surprised that even a Mexican should pretend that we began the war. How would he have hung his head to think that Americans and American legislators should be found standing with the bragging and swift-running Amoudia ?

Here the Chairman's rod of fate fell with a hollow sound

FROM A CORRESPONDENT.

"OUTRAGE AGAINST A SOVEREIGN STATE. "OUTRAGE AGAINST A SO THIS WHO has questions "That the youngest State in the Union, who has questions to have welfare, should be hat the youngest state in the Union, who has questions before Congress deeply interesting to her welfare, should be denied the privilege of having representatives in the Senate of the United States to participate in its proceedings, and that brought about by the Whig party, for the sake of their own miserable party purposes, is a gross and almost unpar

So speaks the "Union" in its preface to a letter announcing that Iowa will not be represented in the Senate at this on of Congress. "A gross and unparalleled outra do what? To do precisely what the Locofoco friends of the government editor did at the regular session of the Legislature-prevent the election of Senators. Their conduct is properly characterized in this brief paragraph—it was "a gross and unparalleled outrage, "planned and executed "for the sake of their own miserable party purposes." And yet the Executive organ, now so filled with patriotic indignation, had not word to say then-neither censure nor rebuke escaped it. What are the facts? The Whigs had a majority in the House, and, with the "independent Democrats," a majority on joint ballot. Their opponents held the Senate, and they never agreed to meet the House in convention until they thought the candidates of their party would be elected to the Senate; then they went into the joint meeting in accordance with the resolution offered by a Whig Senator that the two Houses should "meet and elect" United States Senators and Supreme Judges. As soon, however, as the result of the first ballot was announced, showing that their caucus nominees could not and that Whigs would be elected, the political friends of the "Union" did all in their power, and finally acceeded to adjourn the meeting ; and ever afterwards, notwithstanding the imperative character of the resolution under which they had met, did they refuse to meet again. Their conduct in the meeting, too, was not only bullying but disgraceful, as the proceedings will show.

The Legislature adjourned, therefore, without an election. In the mean time, in consequence of their success in filling two vacancies which had occurred in the House of Representatives—one in the county of Des Moines and another in the county of Lee-the Governor called a special session. The Legislature assembled, and in the Senate and also in the House there was a seat filled by a member who had removed. subsequently to the adjournment of the regular session of the Legislature, into another than the county he was originally chosen to represent. These members had tendered their resignations to the Governor for this reason, which he, in view of his intention to call a special session, refused to accept. And why? Because the counties they assumed to represent to represent at the instance and by the will of a partisan Governor-were of doubtful politics, and would probably have returned Whigs as their successors. This would not have suited the Governor and his counsellors, who, in violation of all propriety and all right, too, were resolved to elect Senators in violence to the declared will of the people.

Looking to this state of things, and believing that a Legislature thus constituted could neither constitutionally nor right fully elect either Senators or Judges, the Whigs of the House declined to pass a resolution providing for their election. In this they did their duty to their constituents and the constitution, and we rejoice that neither fears nor threats determed them from its performance. Let the "Union" rail on, then = the facts furnish their vindication.

ANOTHER FATAL MISTARE IN MEDICINE. - Another fatal ANOTHER FATAL MISTARE IN MEDICINE.—Another fatal mistake from the carelessness of an apothecary has occurred at Alleghany city. A Mr. Van Winkle went to purchase pulverized rhubarb. Another customer had previously called for some pulverized opium, which had been put up and was lying on the counter of the store. The rhubarb was also put up and laid upon the counter, and Mr. Van Winkle, it is presumed, took up the opium instead of the rhubarb, neither of which, through the carelessness of the apothecary, had been labelled. Mr. Van Winkle administered the medicine to his children, causing the death of one of them, a child of two or three years of age. three years of age.

ANOTHER SUSPENSION .- The Antietam Iron Works, own ed by Mr. Gilmon, of Baltimore, have been suspend all the hands paid off and discharged, the proprietor in